DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 732 CS 206 190

AUTHOR Comprone, Joseph J.
TITLE Literature and the Writing Process: A Pedagogical Reading of William Faulkner's "Barn Burning".
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (32nd, Dallas, TX, March 26-28, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College English; *Critical Reading; *Expository Writing; Higher Education; *Integrated Activities; *Literary Criticism; *Literature Appreciation; Sequential Approach; Teaching Methods; Writing Exercises; *Writing Instruction; Writing Processes

ABSTRACT

Writing can be taught most effectively when teachers build the disorienting characteristics of reading literature into the inventive stages (prewriting and revision) of writing literary interpretations. The reading of literature and the process of composing interpretive essays are both different and similar. They are similar because they are both processes occurring over space and time that are informed and controlled by objectively shared conventions and subjectively experienced reactions to outside, "public" events. They are different because one--the reading of literature--explicitly emphasizes the function of cognitive dissonance in the construction of meaning, while the other--the writing of interpretive essays--results in a product that transcribes dissonance into ordered, clearly developed, coherent applications of theses. A story such as William Faulkner's "Barn Burning" can become the reader's means of learning to question and revise hypotheses, while writing an interpretive response to part or all of "Barn Burning" offers the reader a means of putting the answer to those questions in continuous and ordered form. (Three sequentially organized writing exercises on "Barn Burning" are offered and explained for their attendance to this approach to teaching literature and composition as integrated, complementary activities.) (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199732

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

LITERATURE AND THE WRITING PROCESS: A PEDAGOGICAL READING OF WILLIAM FAULKNER'S "BARN BURNING"

Joseph J. Comprone

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph J. Comprone

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS206190

Literature and the Writing Process: A Pedagogical Reading of William Faulkner's "Barn Burning"

Many English teachers have been devoting more teaching and research time than ever before to composition. The profession has refined its understanding of what happens during the processes of reading and writing; it has further developed its understanding of rhetorical principles and their usefulness as strategies for solving conceptual problems while a writing is being produced; and it has expanded its application of linguistic and cognitive theories to the making of courses, assignments, and revised methods of evaluation--to just about every aspect of composition teaching.[1] So much attention, in fact, has been given to composition theory and practice at many national and regional English conferences that one often hears conversations in the bars and coffee shops of conference hotels that are spiced with references to the "composition mafia," the "literacy brigade," and the "new breed English technocrats."

These terms are, of course, most often applied by literature teachers--most of whom still compose a beleaguered majority--to composition teachers whom they fear are driving literature from its sacred place of authority in most English curricula and replacing it with competency tests, behavioral objectives, rhetorical rules, and shop-worn handbooks.

These fears, as far as the composition specialists I know best are concerned, are usually completely unwarranted. And recently, with the emphasis on what literary theorists have come to call "the act of reading," the possibilities of rapprochement between literature and composition teachers seem much more substantive. What composition experts are saying about the writing and reading processes are strikingly similar to much of what these contemporary literary theorists have been saying about the process of reading literature.

It is time that we explore as a profession the ways in which composition and literary theory might function together to produce new and useful approaches to

the teaching of reading and writing. I shall begin with a selective summary of how much of current literary theory suggests we describe the reading process.

Literature as Decomposition

Stanley Fish begins a recent book on seventeenth-century literature with the remark that "It is characteristic of these works....first to involve the reader in discursive activities--evaluating, deducing, interpreting--and then to declare invalid or premature the conclusions these activities yield. The result is a disturbing and unsettling experience in the course of which a reader is continually revising his understanding until... the very possibility of understanding itself is called into question" (Self-Consuming Artifacts, Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1972, p.vii). Wolfgang Iser, in another recent book on literary theory, proposes the idea that reading is actually a process of decomposition in which readers are forced by generic, structural, and social features of a text to take on a series of different stances on the conflicts that are represented in the work. The result is a dialectic in which readers recognize conflict, find seeming or potential reconciliation, then see new conflicts and experience new reconciliations that are subsequently further decomposed (The Act of Reading, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1978). Experienced readers of literature learn to expect and use this dialectical process as a means of going beyond the flow of expectations and fulfillments that are common to other forms of discourse. Iser, then, defines the literary reading process by focusing on the decomposing effects the work has on the reader as he or she composes responses. Literary reading disorients by creating expectations that are then disappointed; other types of reading, in contrast, work to fulfill created expectations.

Newspaper readers read for ideas and information; they do not enter the worlds that are represented in their articles. Someone reading an account of a fire at the Las Vegas Hilton expects and finds statistics on damages, injuries, and

fatalities, a straightforward, objective and seemingly omniscient narration of events, and references to the opinions of observers, police, firefighters, and victims. In all of this, our newspaper readers expect what readability experts call "flow," or what English teachers and critics of informative prose usually define as coherence or cohesion, the structural and semantic transitions that function to assure that readers get from one place to another without too much dissonance.[2]

Readers of a literary piece, however, expect to be thrust inside the event (or story), to experience different perspectives, to find their way inside different characters and observers, to examine the emotions represented and the actions described from different angles, to look over the shoulders of implied readers who share with them the literary need to look beyond the surface of an event--its statistics, prose summaries, and descriptions. Literary readers are engaged, in other words, in a deconstructive activity; they are using language as a way of re-experiencing an experience, not as a way of knowing an experience. As Iser puts it "The text can never be grasped as a whole--only as a series of changing viewpoints, each one restricted in itself and so necessitating further perspectives. This is the process by which the reader 'realizes' an overall situation" (The Act of Reading, p. 68).

The Composing Process

What has current composition research and theory been saying that might be synthesized with this literary theory? Recent studies of the composing processes of professional writers and students—whether empirically-based longitudinal or case studies or more theoretical speculation based on contemporary language philosophy, linguistics, and rhetoric--suggest that all composing is problem-oriented, that things really begin to happen in writing when writers perceive frictions or dissonance among ideas that were previously thought to be compatible. Reading, in turn, becomes interesting when readers feel the tension that is inherent in

these textual focal points and respond by shifting their stances in relation to the complexities of the reading experience.

But, aside from composition theory's emphasis on the importance of friction and conflict in the composing process, recent work in discourse theory and rhetoric re-emphasizes the significance classical rhetoric gave to the rhetorical situation. Writers must learn to figure out, experts say, the situations within which they write--or they will put the best-laid plans and the most well-learned skills to inappropriate use.

Finally, composition theorists have also drawn implications about writing from cognitive psychology and learning theory. These disciplines suggest that writing programs organize themselves around progressive sequences which move from more personal, concrete, and subjective to more abstract and objective forms of discourse. This type of progression follows developmental learning patterns as they have been outlined in the work of Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner, and Luria, and in composition theorists such as James Britton and James Moffett.[3]

It is in regard to these current insights that writing teachers can make best use of literature and current literary theory. Literature, because of its dependence on the reader's experiencing of different perspectives, emphasizes the decomposing aspects of the reading experience. Most of the writing that we assign in composition and literature classes, however, is referential or informative. It places emphasis on the writer's carrying out of clearly-defined expectations--hence our emphasis on theses, topic sentences, clear transitional signals, and stylistic consistency in most writing classes in college. Most writing texts, and most writing teachers, construct plans that imply that writers should have ideas completely thought out before they set pen to page and that readers should experience what communications experts call "good continuation," the easy flow of mind from one point to another as reading progresses.

Composing is, however, primarily a process that frames and organizes in non-linear ways the history of an idea developing. It does not result in a simple report on that idea--even in the most scientific and expository of prose. Furthermore, in literary discourse, paradoxically, still the kind of discourse most often used in

college writing classes, critical theory tells us that serious authors strive to disorient and disconcert readers as they read, providing them with premises and perspectives that become platforms upon which contradictory ideas and experiences are then erected, and new theories and attitudes are built. Perhaps it is precisely this contradiction between what English teachers experience as they read literature and what they do when they teach writing that causes much of the traditional cynicism and scepticism among English teachers about the possibility of teaching composition effectively. In essence, the literature teacher as composition teacher often demands a unity and coherence that can only come after the actual experience of literature, yet these same teachers seem to assume that students know how to "experience" literature. The result is often a classroom situation in which a general discussion of a literary work, however rich and rewarding in and of itself, becomes a substitute for teaching writing, and then the students are simply turned loose to write a coherent, expository essay without any attention to the problems of transferring the complex process of responding to a literary work to paper.

English teachers can, however, turn this sometimes paralyzing contradiction into a useful paradox simply by using literature as a counterpoint to the kind of referential expositon that is usually demanded in college classes, and by contrasting both literary and referential exercises in their classes. Literature would, then, become the means of using writing as a way of capturing and framing the process of thinking, and the means of counterpointing the difference between literary and referential discourse in the composition classroom.

Writing about William Faulkner's "Barn Burning"

In Self-Consuming Artifacts Stanley Fish argues that Francis Bacon fostered the inductive scientific method in his essays by structuring formal rhetorical outlines, usually drawn from classical oration, which he then subverted by presenting complex, paradoxical, and often contradictory arrays of observed, first-hand illustrations (pp. 78-155). What begins, in Bacon's essays, as an informal discussion of common virtues gradually turns into an ironic essay on conventional aphorisms. Bacon employs stylistic contrast, logical paradox, and the hard facts of experience--Fish argues--to contradict the very

premises of the generalities that begin each essay. The persona of Bacon's essays shifts from the abstract moralist talking of the way things should be to the modern scientist bound to the hard facts.

All serious literature, Fish suggests and Iser argues, provides essentially the same type of reading experience as Bacon's Essays. What are the disorienting structures in "Barn Burning" and how should they affect readers?

"Barn Burning" takes up three common Faulknerian concerns: subjective narration used to bring readers more dramatically into the story by heightening the reader's sense of values in transition and opposition; characterization in which good and bad actions become less important than questions related to the motivations and causes of those actions; and scene or setting, which becomes a representation of the Old South transforming itself into the shapes and forms, however commercial and paltry, of twentieth-century, commercial America. These three basic elements of fictional structure--narrative structure and point of view, characterization, and setting or scene--become Faulkner's primary means of disorienting his reader's conventional, literary expectations and, for those readers, they provide the means of making what might have been a sociological tract on the clash of traditional and contemporary values in Southern culture early in the twentieth century into a literary work in which readers subjectively re-experience the emotions of people who are caught up in this social transition.

As teachers of composition and literature, how might we use these three elements, with particular focus upon point of view and narrative structure, to create writing exercises that would (1) illustrate the essentially deconstructive experience of reading serious literature, (2) show how that experience can lead to a more complex understanding of specific values as they are represented in this story, and (3) enable them to look back upon their reading experiences as foundations upon which to develop their interpretations of Faulkner's intentions.[4]

I shall begin to answer this complicated question by describing three sequentially-organized writing exercises, all of which are consistent with definitions of stages

in the composing process as they are explained by current composition theorists. These exercises are explained in language addressed to teachers, who would have to rewrite them for students.

1. Explain the clash of traditional (as represented by Major deSpain and his mansion) and current (as represented by the town, it legal system, and its evolving commercialism) values as they are represented in "Barn Barning." Then add to that some general explanation of the story's point of view. In other words, create a frame around the experience of the story that will help inexperienced readers find their way into it. Once they have projected themselves into the story, current reading theory tells us that fluent readers would construct general guesses about the whole meaning of the story, which their subsequent reading would help them revise into more succinct and specific meanings. The "reading frame" that would be provided in constructing this exercise would have to remain general, but it should bring the student into the general social, generic, and fictional context of the story.

   Follow this orienting introduction to the story by having students read the first two or three pages of the story, covering the scene in the grocery store in which a local justice of the peace hears and dismisses the case against Abner Snopes and then instructs Snopes to leave town. This first scene establishes the narrator's dramatic focus upon the boy, Sartoris Snopes, who will become the central point of view in the story.

   Have students write a two or three page expressive piece in which they describe and explain Sartoris' feelings. They should finish by offering a tentative, exploratory explanation of why the boy feels as he does. They will, in other words, reproduce Sarty's feelings in response to this opening scene in language as free-formed as Sartoris' own.

2. These relatively short, expressive pieces should be collected and examples of the best distributed to the class and discussed. Here are the types of questions that a teacher might use to show students the essentially disorienting intention of a serious literary work: What would you have thought of Abner Snopes if this opening scene had been told from another, more objective point of view? How would you explain the boy's confusion as he observes the judge and townspeople in relation to his family? What seems to be the essential conflict of the story, once you have finished reading this opening scene?

When these questions have been discussed and brought into focus, they should become the platform upon which students construct guesses as they read the next section, which covers the Snopes's relocation, Abner's initial visit—with Sartoris—to Major deSpain's mansion, the episodes related to "cleaning" and returning the besmeared rug, the hearing in town in which Abner is ordered to repay the Major and Abner, and his sons' activities as they spend the rest of the afternoon in town. When students have finished this section, they should write an informal explanation of how Sartoris' ideas about his father change and why. The writing should include specific references to the text to support the interpretation of Sartoris' character changes, and it should conclude with a guess, informed by previous reading and discussion, as to what the end of the story will suggest about Sartoris Snopes's future. At this point, students might be asked to reconsider one of the three questions concerning the narrative point of view: what if the story had been narrated by another character, how would they explain Sartoris' confusion, and what now seems to be the central conflict of the story?

This second writing interrupts the story at a point where the significance of sharing the boy's point of view has been brought into dramatic focus. We do not, as readers, yet know that Abner will attempt to burn the Major's barn, but Faulkner's implied reader should indeed expect Abner to return to barn burning, despite the fact that the leisurely afternoon in town might make a less wary reader, a reader less sensitive to Abner's character, think that Abner had passed beyond his instinctive "hatred and despair." By this point in the story, internal patterns of repetition—Abner's characteristic feelings of hatred and despair, as they are represented by repeated associations of the color black and fire with Abner, his repeated and willfully agressive responses to those who instill those feelings, and our evolving knowledge of how the Snopes's lives have been lived according to Abner's instinctive hatred for those who control his life--should have combined with the implied reader's ingrained sense of social justice and retribution, as it is represented in Sartoris' remark, twenty years later, that "If I had said they [the judges, the court] wanted only truth, justice, he would have hit me again."[5] This second exercise should help students synthesize internal structure (through considerations of point of view) and shared values that are implied in the text. It should also bring students from expressive to informal, expository writing.

This second stage in the act of responding in writing to the act of reading should also help students experience the conflict between Sarty's family ties (with Abner) and the externally-established and abstract social values that are manifested in Major deSpain, the magistrates, and the townspeople. By re-experiencing, in expressive discourse, Sarty's inner conflicts, student-readers had already asked themselves

what Sarty felt in response to the first hearing. Now they consider the effects on Sarty of the deSpain house, Abner's slap, the second hearing, and the seemingly leisurely afternoon with his father and brother in town. They, at the close of this second stage, are ready to write more objective accounts of Sarty's attitude toward his father, the town and its values, and what they think the end of the story will be. They may, at this point in reading, mistakenly expect Sarty to find a firm and permanent place within his family. Abner, after all, seems more reasonable here than he did during the trials, and the sharing of the family lunch also seems to prepare readers for a psychological "coming home," a reconciliation between Sarty and his family.[6]

3. Have students write an analyses of the ending of the story by comparing what they had guessed the ending would be at the close of the second exercise with their response to the actual ending. This third exercise should be assigned before the students read the final two or three pages of the story, which includes Abner's preparations for burning the Major's barn, the boy's struggles to free himself--literally and figuratively--from his family, the boy's warning to Major deSpain, and the final episode in which the boy hears the two shots from the direction of the barn, sleeps, and sets out for the woods. Discussion of how these incidents might change the reader's expectations of the meaning of the ending, as expressed in the second exercise, should come before the final section is read and written about. This final exercise in the sequence should bring students to considerations of two objective factors: the reader's final guesses about the author's intention and the social significance of the clash of values in the story. It should, in the process, complete the progression from expressive to informal exposition to objective, more formal exposition.

Why do these exercises accomplish an effective synthesis of literary and composing theories?

First, by emphasizing narrative perspective and its effects on readers, these exercises help students recognize and employ what current literary theory tells us about the act of reading by clarifying the shifts from the boy's point of view to the implied author's and narrator's. They also, in sequence, encourage the student to experience these shifting perspectives in ways that can lead to a final, synthesized perspective, reflective of the implied author's meaning.

Second, they are consistent with contemporary theories of composing because they establish a model of the process of writing in which more subjective and expressive discourse leads naturally to more objective, informative discourse. In other words, these exercises gradually lead students up the ladder of abstraction, working from a subjective re-experiencing of point of view and character in expressive discourse to more objective interpretations of meaning and significance in the form of referential discourse.

Third, and finally, by experiencing both subjective and objective stances in relation to the story as it is experienced students come to understand better the differences between literary discourse and its essentially disorienting and tension-creating function and the more direct and fulfilled expectations of the expository discourse they are most often asked to produce in college and on jobs.

What does this critical and pedagogical analysis of "Barn Burning" contribute to our critical understanding of the story and Faulkner's fiction in general? First, it does a better job than previous criticism of "Barn Burning" because it clarifies the function of narrative structure and point of view in the story (see footnote 4). Joseph Reed does a careful job, in Faulkner's Narrative,

of explaining how Faulkner employs the child-narrator as a means of comprehending both the innocent apprehension of physical sensation and the more complex and abstract perspectives of adults (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973, p. 38). But he does not, as Hyatt H. Waggoner suggests in a review of Reed's book, give full treatment to the effects these narrative manipulations of Sarty's consciousness have on readers (American Literature, XLV, iii, November 1973, 471-472).[7] As a result, Reed's analysis often seems to extoll craft over meaning and interpretation, to accentuate the making of a story rather than the way the story's craft effects readers. He is right in suggesting that no simple, paraphrased meaning statement can explain what the experience of reading a Faulkner narrative means, cumulatively, to an ideal reader.[8] But he is wrong to assume that "meaning" can be subsumed by such a simple, after-the-fact definition; much of current reading theory, in fact, emphasizes the reaction against just such an oversimplification of meaning in literature.[9]

Once students experience different levels of response to Sarty's consciousness—which is controlled by an assumed author who sometimes brings readers up very close to Sarty as he experiences events (the hearings, his father's first trip to the deSpain mansion), sometimes has readers view Sarty from a relative distance (the final scene as Sarty sleeps and then heads for the woods), and sometimes interrupts Sarty's child's point of view with a flash-forward to a more mature observation by an obviously older person—they come to appreciate Faulkner's narrative complexity as itself the experienced meaning of the story, not as a technical set of structures which mechanically added together produce a paraphrase of the story's meaning.

As far as Faulkner's fiction in general is concerned, Walter Slatoff ("The Edge of Order: The Pattern of Faulkner's Rhetoric," Faulkner: Four Decades of Criticism, ed. by Linda Wagner, East Lansing: Michigan State University Press,

1973) best expresses the advantages that evolve from my emphasis on reader response in understanding the work:

> Faulkner is more of an irrationalist than many of his critics have been willing to accept, but less of one than he....has often suggested by his varied assertions that 'ideas and facts have very little connection with truth'....For the mere act of reading Faulkner requires a large intellectual effort and much of his appeal is clearly intellectual (p. 177).

It is exactly this appeal as it applies to the act of reading that teachers must have students experience as they read a story like "Barn Burning," and it is this phenomenological process of reading that critics must have in mind when they explain the rhetorical effects of Faulkner's manipulations of distance, subjectivity, and objectivity in his narratives.

To return to the classroom, we should remind ourselves that the reading of literature and the process of composing interpretive essays are both different and similar. They are similar because they are both processes, occurring over space and time and informed and controlled by objectively shared conventions and subjectively experienced reactions to outside, "public" events. They are different because one—the reading of literature--explicitly emphasizes the function of cognitive dissonance in the construction of meaning, while the other--the writing of interpretive essays--seems to result in a product which transcribes dissonance into ordered, clearly developed, coherent applications of theses. This paper argues, however, that writing is taught most effectively when teachers build the disorienting characteristics of reading literature into the inventive stages, during prewriting and revision, of writing literary interpretations. A story such as "Barn Burning," then, becomes the reader's means of learning to question and revise hypotheses about, while writing an interpretive response after the act of reading has either been

interrupted or completed becomes the reader's means of putting the answer to those questions in a continuous and ordered form. The possibility of constructing such an integrative model for synthesizing writing and reading should remind us that the teacher of composition and the teacher of literature can, indeed, be the same person.

Footnotes

[1] Over the past fifteen years, at least seven new rhetoric and composition journals have been established, and several others have been re-established or upgraded after going unpublished for a number of years. Examples of these journals are the Journal of Basic Writing, Freshman English News, Pre/Text, The Rhetoric Society Quarterly, and Composition and Its Teaching.

[2] The implications of current discourse theory for the teaching of writing and literature are reviewed in James Kinneavy, A Theory of Discourse, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971; in James Britton, Language and Learning, Middlesex, England: Penguin Bks., 1970 and Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod. and Rosen, The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18), London: School Council Research Studies, 1975, also distributed by the National Council of Teachers of English; and the first two essays in Research on Composing, ed. by Cooper and Odell, Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1978. Implicit in my comparison of literature and exposition or referential discourse as it is described here is a recognition that "coherence" in literature is qualitatively different from "coherence" in exposition.

[3] See the previous footnote for references to Britton's work; also see Jean Piaget, The Language and Thought of the Child (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1926), The Construction of Reality in the Child, trans. by Margaret Cook (New York: Basic Books, 1954), and Six Psychological Studies, trans. and ed. by David Elkind and Anita Tenzer (New York: Random House, 1967), Lev Vygotsky, Thought and Language, ed. and trans. by Eugenia Hanfman and Gertrude Vakar (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1962), James Moffett, Teaching the Universe of Discourse (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), and Jerome Bruner, Studies in Cognitive Growth (New York: John Wiley, 1966).

[4] Critical discussion of "Barn Burning" offers varying opinions on what fictional elements are of most importance in an ideal reading of the story. Phyllis Franklin comes closest to my reading when she argues that Sarty is the central focus of "Barn Burning," that it is his story, not Abner's, because it is by experiencing his subjective conflict between instinctive, family ties (Abner) and a more abstract and objective sense of social justice (Major deSpain and the hearing) that we, as readers, come to understand the significance of the values and experience represented in the story ("Sarty Snopes and 'Barn Burning,'" Mississippi Quarterly, XXI, summer 1968, 189-193). Charles Mitchell, although he does a good job of analyzing Faulkner's use of image patterns to define Abner's character, falsely implies that Abner is actually the center of attention as we read the story ("The Wounded Will of Faulkner's Barn Burner," Modern Fiction Studies, XI, summer 1965, 185-189). William Bysshe Stein ("Faulkner's Devil," Modern Language Notes, LXXVI, December 1961, 731-732) also employs new critical emphases on image patterns as ways of establishing Abner's character, but he, also, fails to consider the disorienting effects Sarty's subjective viewpoint has on the reader's perspective on Abner and his symbolic relationship with the society within which he lives.

[5] This reference is taken from a commonly-used college literature anthology--Literature: An Introduction to Fiction, Poetry, and Drama, 2nd ed., ed. by X.J. Kennedy (Boston: Little Brown, 1979), p. 78.

[6] Sarty Snopes disappears from Faulkner's fiction at the end of "Barn Burning." The story is condensed into a very brief passage and narrated by U.K. Ratliff in The Hamlet, but Sartoris is not mentioned by name, nor is he made the center of Ratliff's telling. Abner Snopes has a relatively major part in the Snopes trilogy, where he becomes in 1910 a garden farmer on a small place a short distance from Jefferson.

[7] Waggoner pans the book because he feels Reed ignores theme and meaning while placing too much emphasis on technique. Actually, I believe both Waggoner and Reed miss the central point of Faulknerian narrative: narrative technique is important--not simply because it allows Faulkner to tell a more interesting story--but because it is the primary control over the reader's experience of the story as event. See Louise Rosenblatt, The Reader, The Text, and the Poem (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978) for a careful analysis of reading-as-event and the transactional analysis of the reading process.

[8] Arthur Kinney, in Faulkner's Narrative Poetics (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1978, pp. 71-85), makes this same point about Faulkner's narrative technique in his chapter "Structural Consciousness." Kinney argues that only the reader who understands the purpose of Faulknerian narrative style can integrate the patterns of interweaving structures of both perception and consciousness in the fiction.

[9] Aside from Iser and Fish and Rosenblatt as cited above, see the work of E.D. Hirsch (Validity in Interpretation, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), David Bleich (Subjective Criticism, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), Norman Holland (Dynamics of Literary Response, New York: W.W. Norton, 1975), and Wayne Booth (The Rhetoric of Fiction, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961) for seminal book-length studies of the meaning-making issue. Helen Swink ("William Faulkner: The Novelist as Oral Narrator," Georgia Review XXVI, summer 1972, 183-209) does a careful job of specifying the oral elements in Faulkner's style, but she, like Reed, does not relate that style to its effects on readers.